

III. REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 8, 14, 15, 21, 22 and 23 are amended.
2. Claims 1, 3-4, 8-11, 15 and 17-18 are not anticipated by Picard under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Applicant's invention according to claim 1 recites means to arrange a simultaneous "physical" connection between the terminal and the email server maintaining the first remote mailbox. This is not disclosed or suggested by Picard.

In Picard, the system communicates with the IMS 106 server, and thus requires a separate server for the communication process. Thus, several physical connections from one device to different mail servers are not possible in Picard.

In Fig. 1 Picard discloses a system in which separate TCP/IP connections are formed for each mail system (MS) on a single dialup point-to-point protocol connection from a PC to a router (col. 5 l. 13 to 21). Here, it should be taken into account that during one data call it is possible to form a TCP/IP connection to a VMS system and an EMS system, is no disclosure indicating that the connection could be established to two EMS systems. VMS and EMS are two different physical hardware interfaces, and this is, in fact, mentioned in Picard in col. 5, lines 18 to 21.

On the other hand, if a user of the system of Picard had a browser application and two email boxes such as mailbox1.com and mailbox2.com, the user could log in to both mailboxes during the same connection using separate windows for both email boxes.

For example, consider whether the user could initiate a physical connection by his computer to two different email boxes (for example, privatemail.incoming.mailbox.com and corporatemail.incoming.mailbox.com). In the system of Picard it is possible by contacting the IMS 106 which has a significant role in handling connections between the user device and different message centers. In the system of Picard, the email server containing the first email box privatemail.incoming.mailbox.com and/or the email server containing the second email box corporatemail.incoming.mailbox.com are not directly accessed by the user device, but rather the IMS 106 is needed in-between. The user device receives the information which the IMS 106 sends to it. In other words, the special server (IMS 106) is needed via which emails are delivered. See, for example, col. 6, lines 42 to 62. Picard does not disclose or suggest forming more than one physical connection between a user device and different email servers, as is claimed by Applicant.

Thus, claims 1, 8 and 15 are not disclosed or suggested. Claims 3-4, 9-11 and 17-18 should also be allowable at least in view of their respective dependencies.

3. Claims 5-6, 12-13, 19-20 and 23 are not unpatentable over Picard under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) at least in view of their respective dependencies.

4. Claims 14 and 21-22 are not unpatentable over Picard and further in view of AAPA under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In the "AAPA" section referred to by the Examiner, it is only mentioned that a user can have several different PDP connections.

Applicant does not admit that a single application could have more than one PDP connection. On the contrary, in the summary of invention on page 6 it is mentioned that it "is possible to attain this purpose in such a manner that each e-mail server, which one wishes to use simultaneously, is advantageously provided with a PDP connection of its own. Thus, it is possible to provide the user interface of the e-mail program with a possibility to control several different remote mailboxes simultaneously. In the e-mail program, the different remote mailboxes are distinguished from each other by means of unique identifications, such as icons and/or names of the remote mailboxes, wherein the user can determine the remote mailbox to which each function and notification relates."

On the basis of above, it is possible to form several PDP connections for one application and this is not admitted as prior art by Applicant, but rather this possibility is disclosed as a part of the invention.

Furthermore, in col. 2 lines 26-33 Picard, mentions "to provide message waiting/urgent notifiers when new or urgent messages are deposited in the mailbox or the message status changes by a simultaneous different connection into the mailbox such as when a mailbox is accessed by computer and while the computer is logged into the mailbox an access via telephone interface deletes the message". This disclosure in Picard indicates that two different connections from two different devices (the computer and the telephone) can be provided to the same mailbox. Picard also does not mention PDP connections as a possibility to communicate with the message systems.

Thus, claims 14 and 21-22 are not disclosed or suggested by Picard in view of any AAPA.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,


Geza C. Ziegler Jr.

Reg. No. 44,004

Perman & Green, LLP

425 Post Road

Fairfield, CT 06824

(203) 259-1800 Ext. 134

Customer No.: 2512

28 June 2005
Date

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner of Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office fax number (571)-273-8300.

Date: June 25, 2005

Signature: Meaghan Baye
Person Making Transmission